



9/10  
AF/NE  
E. Williams

**PATENT** 10.10.02  
P-4423D1

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

APPLICANT(S): D.J. Wright et al

**EXPEDITED PROCEDURE  
UNDER 37 C.F.R. 1.116**

SERIAL. NO.: 09/778,218

ART UNIT: 1634

FILING DATE: June 17, 1999

EXAMINER: B. Forman

FOR: METHOD AND OLIGONUCLEOTIDES FOR DETECTING NUCLEIC ACID  
SEQUENCE VARIATIONS

**BOX AF**

**RESPONSE PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R.**  
**§1.116**

Honorable Commissioner for Patents  
Washington, D.C. 20231

I HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THIS CORRESPONDENCE IS BEING DEPOSITED WITH THE UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE AS FIRST CLASS MAIL IN AN ENVELOPE ADDRESSED TO: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS, WASHINGTON, D.C. 20231	
ON: <u>September 26, 2002</u>	(DATE OF DEPOSIT)
BY: <u>Danna M Baumann</u>	(NAME)
<u>Danna M Baumann</u>	9-26-02
(SIGNATURE)	(DATE)

Sir:

Responsive to the Final Rejection mailed on March 27, 2002, please amend the above-identified application as follows.

**IN THE CLAIMS:**

Please amend Claim 1 as follows.

1. (2x Amended) A method for identifying a single nucleotide polymorphism in a target in an isothermal target amplification reaction, said method comprising:
  - a) hybridizing a detector primer to the target, wherein the detector primer comprises a diagnostic nucleotide for the single nucleotide polymorphism, said diagnostic nucleotide located about two to four nucleotides 5' of the 3' nucleotide of the detector primer which is complementary to the target sequence;
  - b) amplifying the target by hybridization and extension of the detector primer;

**RECEIVED**

OCT 08 2002

TECH CENTER 1600/2900

- c) determining an efficiency of detector primer extension is greater, lesser or equal to the efficiency of extension of a detector primer without said diagnostic nucleotide; and
- d) detecting the presence or absence of the single nucleotide polymorphism based on the efficiency of detector primer extension.

#### REMARKS

Claims 1 and 3-22 are in the present application.

In order to further clarify the present invention and advance prosecution, Applicants have amended Claim 1. Applicants shall address the rejections under 35 USC §103(a) below.

#### I. Obviousness - 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a)

- A. Claims 1-5, 7-12, 14-18, and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly rendered unpatentable by Newton et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,595,890) in view of Reynolds et al (U.S. Patent 5,763,184) and Krausa et al. (Human Immunology, 44:35-42, 1995). It was alleged that Newton et al. disclose all aspects of the rejected claims except that Newton et al. do not teach the diagnostic nucleotide is about one to four nucleotides from a 3' terminal nucleotide. It was alleged that diagnostic nucleotides adjacent to the 3' end were well known in the art at the time the invention was made as taught by Reynolds et al and Krausa et al. It was further alleged that "while Reynolds et al. do not teach an embodiment wherein the primer is complementary to a polymorphic site near the primer's 3' end, Krausa et al. teach a similar method wherein the diagnostic primer comprises a diagnostic nucleotide about one to four nucleotides 5' of the 3' terminal nucleotide." Thus, it was alleged that "one skilled in the art would have been motivated by the teaching of Krausa et al. to modify the primers of Newton et al. as suggested by Reynolds et al. to derive diagnostic primers having a diagnostic nucleotides one to four nucleotides 5' of the 3' end."

Applicants respectfully submit that none of the cited prior art references, neither in combination nor singly, teach or suggest the claimed invention as amended. Specifically, Claim 1 as amended sets forth that the diagnostic nucleotide is located two to four nucleotides from the 3' end of the reporter probe. Support for the amendment to Claim 1 can be found on Page 3, Line 30 to Page 4, Line 20 and Page 5, Line 22 to Page 6, Line 24 of the present application.

The diagnostic primer of amended Claim 1 is not taught or suggested by Krausa et al., since Krausa et al. do not teach a primer with diagnostic nucleotides located two to four nucleotides from the 3' end of the primer for purposes of detecting single nucleotide polymorphisms. Krausa et al. do not disclose a detector primer with the diagnostic nucleotide located two to four nucleotides from the 3' end of the diagnostic primer. Krausa et al. disclose detection of multi-nucleotide

sequence differences between allelic variants, whereas the subject matter of Claim 1 is specific to the detection of single nucleotide polymorphisms.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that one of ordinary skill would not have been motivated by the teaching of Krausa et al. to modify the primers of Newton et al. as allegedly suggested by Reynolds et al. to derive diagnostic primers having a diagnostic nucleotide two to four nucleotides 5' of the 3' end.

- B. Claim 6 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C §103(a) as allegedly rendered unpatentable by Newton et al. in view of Reynolds et al and Krausa et al, and further in view of Mullis et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,683,195).

The combination of Newton et al., Reynolds et al, and Krausa et al. do not teach or suggest the claimed invention as discussed above, and the secondary reference Mullis et al adds no further teachings which would enable one of ordinary skill in the art to achieve the claimed invention.

- C. Claim 13 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C §103(a) as allegedly rendered unpatentable by Newton et al. in view of Reynolds et al and Krausa et al, and further in view of Guatelli et al (Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA, 87:1874-1878, 1990).

For the same reasons provided above, Applicants respectfully submit that none of the cited art teach or suggest the claimed invention and Guatelli et al. is a secondary reference that adds no further teachings which would enable one of ordinary skill to achieve the claimed invention.

- D. Claims 19 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C §103(a).as allegedly rendered unpatentable by Newton et al. in view of Reynolds et al and Krausa et al and further in view of Chen et al (Nucleic Acids Research, 25(2): 347-353, 1997).

For the same reasons provided above, Applicants respectfully submit that none of the cited art teach or suggest the claimed invention, and Chen et al. is a secondary reference that adds no further teachings which would enable one of ordinary skill to achieve the claimed invention.

- E. Claim 22 was rejected under 35 U.S.C §103(a) as allegedly rendered unpatentable by Newton et al. in view of Reynolds et al and Krausa et al, and further in view of Walker et al. (Nucleic Acids Research, 20(7): 1691-1696, 1992).

For the same reasons provided above, Applicants respectfully submit that none of the cited art teach or suggest the claimed invention, and Walker et al. is a secondary reference that adds no further teachings which would enable one of ordinary skill in the art to achieve the claimed invention.

Accordingly, in view of the above amendment and remarks, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the present rejections under Section 103.

II. Conclusions

The claims of the present application are believed to be in condition for allowance, and early notice thereof is respectfully requested. Attached hereto is a marked-up version of the changes made to the claims on the attached page entitled "Version with Markings to Show Changes Made".

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read "Bruce S. Weintraub", with a stylized, cursive flourish at the end.

Bruce S. Weintraub  
Attorney for the Applicant  
Registration No. 34,277

Becton Dickinson and Company  
1 Becton Drive  
Franklin Lakes, New Jersey 07416  
(201) 847-7096